

Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Spills Working Group  
Prevention, Preparedness, Response, and Restoration  
Meeting Notes  
10:00 to 2:00 - August 12, 2009  
OCNMS 115 E. Railroad Ave., Port Angeles, Washington

**Overview:**

- The attached agenda identifies the topics covered during the meeting and provides brief notes on the associated discussion.
- Meeting attendees are identified in the attached roster.
- Written comments submitted to the group are provided.
- Unless an additional web link is provided, background documents mentioned here are available at [http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/protection/mpr/mpr\\_Econserve.html](http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/protection/mpr/mpr_Econserve.html)

**Meeting Agenda**

- I. Welcome
- II. Agenda Overview and Meeting Goals
- III. Working Group Charge from the OCNMS Advisory Council (AC)
  - Management Plan Review (MPR) 101: Public involvement is significant throughout the process of developing a revised management plan for OCNMS. AC and Intergovernmental Policy Council helped identify short list of priority management needs for focus of MPR. A draft management plan is due 36 months following the September 2008 start of scoping process.
  - This working group addresses one element in the Priority Issues Work Plan ([http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/protection/mpr/mpr\\_bgdocs.html](http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/protection/mpr/mpr_bgdocs.html)) under Priority Issue E – Conserve Natural Resources in the Sanctuary. Another working group addressing this priority issue is focused on Living Resource Conservation.
  - The spills working group's task is to provide recommended actions for OCNMS work during the next 5-10 years in the form of strategies and activities. An example report on the Area To Be Avoided was provided (available on OCNMS web site). Draft recommendations will be forwarded to the AC, reviewed and possibly modified, then provided by the AC to the Sanctuary Superintendent.
- IV. Participant Introductions
- V. Background on Spill Issues at Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary
  - The Spills WG background document (available on OCNMS web site) was introduced.
  - Some participants stated it is important to first review accomplishments relative to the 1994 OCNMS management plan, then consider future role of OCNMS.
- VI. Candidate Issues
  - A "Candidate Spills Working Group Topics" document was reviewed (available on OCNMS web site) with initial ideas shared about each item.
  - Notes on this discussion are provided below (added to the original document *in italics*).
- VII. Planning Next Steps

## Action Items

### Lead identified in [name]

1. Request Seattle Marine Exchange of Puget Sound to provide information on how AIS data archiving is done; needs and initiatives [Bohlman]
2. Review WA State-USCG efforts on coastal towing vessel practices that exist or have been discussed for establishing approaches (best practices, standards of care, regulations, etc.) that reduce coastal towing risks. [Boothe]
3. Review OCNMS Contingency Plan, a site specific plan, to determine how it can have unique value independent of NW ACP and other planning documents. [Pavia]
4. Review OCNMS-USCG MOU for spill related issues. [Pavia] – *Complete: posted to web site*
5. Investigate current status and initiatives to digitize ESI maps for outer coast. [Pavia] – *Complete: In notes on page 5.*
6. Request information on marine debris disposal and spill waste from county governments. note: clarify with Mike Doherty - [Pavia]
7. Determine if OPSCAN communications system modified for temporary installations. note: clarify with Mike Doherty - [Pavia]
8. Review WDFW-Navy NRDA protocols. [George Hart/ Antrim]
9. Review OCNMS 1994 management plan and summarize accomplishments [Antrim/Galasso]
10. Update background document to include relevant discharge, contingency plan, and vessel traffic comments from FEIS/Management plan (1993) [Pavia] – *Complete: posted to web site*
11. For subsequent meetings:
  - Organize by 4 topic areas (Prevention, Preparedness, Response, Restoration)
  - Start with Prevention
  - Provide topical strategies and activities for group to consider [Boothe]

Please contact the Item lead if you have questions, suggestions, or would like to volunteer help.

Candidate Spills Working Group Topics  
As Modified During Meeting Discussions

Prevention

1. Area To Be Avoided (ATBA) – this measure routes large and hazardous cargo vessel traffic offshore in the sanctuary. Compliance is voluntary, with very high rates of compliance. OCNMS routinely conducts compliance monitoring and outreach to encourage compliance.
  - *Vessel traffic data throughout the sanctuary must be analyzed regularly for ATBA compliance (as is currently the practice). These data are available through the Tofino Vessel Traffic System and Marine Exchange of Puget Sound.*
  - *Automatic Identification System (AIS) data are not archived, so historical analyses are not possible. See <http://www.navcen.uscg.gov/enav/ais/> USCG is developing an AIS network where data may be archived in the future. Marine Exchange of Puget Sound has talked with the BC/States Task Force about this.*
2. Tug & Barge Traffic Lanes – due to slow travel rates, tug and barge traffic lanes differ from large vessel lanes, which may create potential risk.
  - *Topic could be combined with ATBA.*
  - *Lack of AIS programming of cargo by tug/barges is an issue because the cargo volume and hazardous nature is uncertain. Consider extending ATBA coverage to include tug/barges.*
  - *Use of area between in-bound lane and south shore of Strait of Juan de Fuca by barges could be increasing the risk of collision. Concerns related to this “recommended route” include: transits by nuclear submarines (and recent tug/submarine interactions), minimal response time before oil hits shore, transits close to Cape Flattery, and interaction with fishing vessels.*
  - *Develop coastal towing standards of care. Review WA State-USCG work plan on coastal towing vessel standards.*
3. Vessel discharges (bilge, gray/black, other) – some discharges may introduce chemical contaminants. Cruise ship operational (wastewater) discharges are also being addressed by the Living Resource Conservation working group.
  - *To be conducted in coordination with Living Marine Resources working group.*
4. Estimates of activity by vessel type – related to work of Socioeconomic Values working group, sanctuary management will be informed by a better understanding and characterization of ongoing vessel traffic.
  - *Historical analysis requires archived AIS data.*
  - *Accurate predictions of future vessel traffic volumes will be difficult.*

Additional Discussion:

- *Consider additional aid to navigation, in particular Duntze Rock.*
- *Consider addition of oceanographic monitoring equipment on existing aids to navigation. Current sea conditions data are collected at “J” buoy at entrance to*

*Strait and Cape Elizabeth buoy. These data are managed by the National Buoy Data Center.*

#### Preparedness

1. NW Area Committee and Area Contingency Plan (ACP) – This committee regularly updates and improves the NW ACP.
  - *NOAA/ORR has a representative on the NW Area Committee. OCNMS should communicate routinely with this person.*
  - *OCNMS participation in NWAC work groups is important.*
  - *In particular, OCNMS should contribute to ACP alternate technology work group.*
2. Geographic Response (GRP) Plans – WA Dept. of Ecology periodically reviews GRPs to improve initial response to incidents. Two GRPs are relevant to the sanctuary - Outer Coast and Strait of Juan de Fuca.
  - *OCNMS should assist WDOE with periodic GRP updates.*
  - *OCNMS should work with the Outer Coast Marine Resources Committee.*
  - *Feasibility of protection strategies is a question for outer coast. More strategies should be considered, if feasible.*
3. GIS Database – OCNMS maintains a GIS database dedicated to information useful in spill response and participation in Incident Command.
  - *A fundamental question is: What is the best way for ONMS to apply data, information, and people to questions in the Environmental Unit in Incident Command Structure during a spill?*
  - *GIS database development should be done in coordination with the Alternative Technologies Working Group of NWAC.*
  - *GIS development, especially mapping of environmental data, should be coordinated with Research working group as part of MPR. EBM group might take the lead on this.*
  - *Enhance and maintain GIS database, including collaborating with other agencies to improve and share capabilities.*
4. OCNMS Contingency Plan – the sanctuary has a site specific contingency plan for spill response.
  - *This document should be reviewed by the working group to determine if a sanctuary-specific plan has value. Roles in Incident Command and Environmental Unit, etc. should be in the document.*
  - *This plan should address issues not covered in the ACP.*
5. USCG Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) – a sanctuary-USCG MOU outlines agency responsibilities associated with spill response and enforcement.
  - *Need to identify and review spill-related elements of MOU.*
  - *Should also consider in context of USCG-State MOU on spill preparedness and response. Look to where existing agreements could be leveraged by OCNMS.*

6. Coordination with Industry Groups and Ports
  - *Add “local governments” to this item*
7. Coordination with Co-trustees – OCNMS periodically convenes an “Outer Coast Trustees Group” to discuss spills response issues, share training opportunities, etc.
  - *Mentioned as important in context of other topics*
8. Environmental Sensitivity Index (ESI) maps – ESI maps indicate the relative risk of long-term shoreline impacts from oil and may be used to prioritize response and cleanup efforts. ESI maps were produced years ago, and those for most of the outer coast are not available digitally.
  - *Navy has digitized ESI maps for Puget Sound and the Strait of Juan de Fuca, including the outer coast as far south as Point of Arches.*
  - *Funding is required to complete the outer coast, and NOAA and USCG could encourage this.*
  - *Updated information as of August 31, 2009: The NOAA Office of Response and Restoration (OR&R) is responsible for a nationwide effort to update and manage Environmental Sensitivity Index (ESI) maps for oil spill planning and response. The program's goal is to update those maps at least every 7 years. ESI maps for the outer coast of Washington have not been updated since 1985. ESI maps for the Straits of Juan de Fuca, including Cape Flattery, were updated in 2006. NOAA has an agreement with the U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters (CG-5332) Oil and Hazardous Substances Division to update ESI maps to support response missions. Under this agreement, an update to the WA outer coast ESI maps is possible in fiscal year 2010 as part of a project to update maps for the outer coasts of OR and WA. The U.S. Coast Guard provides partial funding for updates under its agreement with NOAA. Work for a specific area is most likely to receive funding with other organizations besides the Coast Guard and NOAA provide matching funding. No such funding has yet to be identified for the WA update. The total estimated cost for the project covering OR and WA is \$550K. Information on ESI availability can be found at:  
[http://response.restoration.noaa.gov/topic\\_subtopic\\_entry.php?RECORD\\_KEY%28entry\\_subtopic\\_topic%29=entry\\_id,subtopic\\_id,topic\\_id&entry\\_id%28entry\\_subtopic\\_topic%29=730&subtopic\\_id%28entry\\_subtopic\\_topic%29=8&topic\\_id%28entry\\_subtopic\\_topic%29=1](http://response.restoration.noaa.gov/topic_subtopic_entry.php?RECORD_KEY%28entry_subtopic_topic%29=entry_id,subtopic_id,topic_id&entry_id%28entry_subtopic_topic%29=730&subtopic_id%28entry_subtopic_topic%29=8&topic_id%28entry_subtopic_topic%29=1)*
9. Drills – sanctuary staff participation in drills is important to improving their effectiveness. Also, drills, including equipment deployment drills, off the outer coast improve response capacity and understanding of feasibility of response technology use during actual events. Various types of spill response exercises and drills- table top, field deployment, NRDA – could be encouraged to focus on the outer coast of Washington.
  - *Various response assets should drill together (i.e., MSRC, NRC, rescue tug, vessels of opportunity).*
  - *Vessels of opportunity, in particular those of tribes on the outer coast, should be included in drills.*

- *Demonstration of new, uncommon, or experimental response technologies is valuable, as has been done in past CANUSPAC drills.*
10. Dispersant Policy/Decision Making – In the NWACP, the sanctuary area is not pre-approved for dispersant application. The sanctuary is given opportunity to express natural resource impacts concerns about dispersant use before Incident Command makes a decision about dispersant use.
- *Natural resource information, particularly water column resources, is needed to inform dispersant use decisions. This information needs to be compiled and readily available in the Environmental Unit at Incident Command.*
11. Response Training – With proper training, sanctuary staff can participate more effectively in spill response.
- *Should consider training for OCNMS staff, as well as individuals and volunteers from local communities. Coordinate with volunteer sub-group of NWAC.*

**Additional Discussion:**

- *Request information on marine debris disposal and spill waste from county governments.*
- *Ocean observing capabilities need to be expanded to better support spill forecasting and response actions, including improved trajectory modeling. Coordinate with NANOOS on implementation.*
- *Question as to whether there is equipment available and capacity to deploy it that is appropriate to ocean conditions present in the sanctuary.*
- *Preparedness and response capabilities at Neah Bay and LaPush can be improved – heavy weather rescue/response capabilities, equipment suitable for open ocean conditions, wildlife rescue, training of residents for response activities.*
- *OCNMS needs to have a strong advocacy role and to increase their involvement in regional planning processes.*
- *Better coordination with ongoing spill prevention/preparedness/response processes, including Puget Sound Partnership, in region*
- *Determine if OPSCAN communications system modified for temporary installations*
- *Track compliance with or encourage WA to complete vessel contingency plan approvals.*

**Response**

1. Roles in Incident Command – Sanctuary staff can participate in a response and serve in various roles – Environmental Unit, Joint Information Center, Liaison, etc.
2. Marine Debris – OCNMS might contribute to planning or response-oriented decisions about marine debris during spill events and vessel casualties.
  - *Removal of gear associated with sunken vessels is an issue. USCG responds to spills threat, not marine debris issues.*

3. Pre-emptive policies (e.g., remove beach logs in advance of oiling, etc.) – some policies might be developed in advance of an ongoing response effort. These policies would likely require collaboration with joint authorities (i.e., Olympic National Park, Tribes, US Fish and Wildlife Service).
  - *Consider marine debris in preemptive cleaning strategies.*
  - *Need to consider how vessels of opportunity could be utilized, done in conjunction with upgrades to spill response infrastructure at Neah Bay or other locations on the outer coast. (Heavy weather, open ocean response capabilities)*
  - *Salvage capacity should be considered and improved.*
  - *Consider use of remote technology in response (e.g., satellites).*

#### Restoration/Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA)

1. Coordinating with Co-trustees – coordination of co-trustees is essential to an effective NRDA response.
  - *Look at ways to get community based training to support pre-assessment. Volunteers with the COASST program (beached/dead bird surveys) should be considered.*
2. Establishing plans, priorities, and protocols – NRDA work can begin immediately during a spill event. Advance planning with co-trustees can improve the NRDA response.
  - *Advance removal of dead macro-animals should be standard policy.*
  - *Improved preparedness for pre-assessment (sampling containers, digital cameras) and associated training*
  - *Navy has manual and training available that might be relevant.*
3. Baseline data collection – baseline data for NRDA may be a goal of monitoring by OCNMS and partners, well in advance of a spill or in advance of a known spill as it approaches various natural resources.
  - *Could be coordinated with Research working group as part of MPR.*

#### Other

- *Get WDNR involved in marine debris issues associated with vessel sinkings.*
- *Recognize trust responsibility to tribes and tribal presence, socio-economic ties to ocean resources.*

August 12, 2009 Spills Working Group Meeting Attendance

Name		Affiliation	Participation		
			Attended In Person	Attended by Phone	Provided Written Comments
Carol	Bernthal	Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary	X		
Chad	Bowechop	Makah tribe	X		
Diane	Butorac	Washington Dept. of Ecology	X		
Tom	Callahan	Washington State Maritime Cooperative			X
Craig	Cornell	Marine Spill Response Corporation	X		
Mike	Doherty	Clallam County Commissioner	X		
Fred	Felleman	Public Interest	X		
George	Galasso	Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary	X		
Tiffany	Gallo	NRC Environmental	X		
Tom	Gibbons	Quinault Nation		X	
Jennifer	Hagen	Quileute tribe	X		
George	Hart	U.S. Navy	X		
Jerry	Joyce	Public Interest	X		
Scott	Knutson	U.S. Coast Guard District	X		
Kevin	Ryan	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	X		
Warren	Scarlette	Hoh Tribe	X		
Colin	Smith	National Park Service	X		
Donna	Spalding	NW Cruise Ship Association		X	X
John	Veentjer	Marine Exchange of Puget Sound	X		
Eric	Wilkins	Intergovernmental Policy Council	X		
Bob	Bohlman	Committee Co-Chair	X		
Chip	Boothe	Committee Co-Chair	X		
Bob	Pavia	Committee Staff	X		
Liam	Antrim	Committee Staff	X		



Tom Callahan, Washington State Maritime Cooperative  
August 11, 2009

While not a full active member of the Working Group, I would like to provide some Washington State Maritime Cooperative (WSMC) comments. Have reviewed the information provided on the Workgroup web site and have the following:

- WSMC would support oil spill drills that involve the Sanctuary. WSMC member vessels transit Sanctuary waters and therefore a spill from a member vessel is not an impossible scenario. WSMC conducts spill drills annually and the scenario location changes as we try to cover the broad area transited by WSMC member vessels (all WA state waters except the Columbia River). WSMC would be glad to work with OCNMS staff in planning a drill in the future that meets WSMC drill needs and incorporates the needs of the OCNMS to the extent possible.
- A formal Sanctuary policy on dispersant usage that helps streamline decision making would be of value. Expediting the dispersant use decision process could help enable the WSMC Incident Commander (IC) to use this response option early on if it is appropriate. This is important since dispersant use is more effective the sooner it is applied.
- WSMC would support the pre-designation of OCNMS staff that are trained and potentially available to fill specific ICS response roles.
- WSMC would support any efforts that enhance the knowledge base of the currents and/or increases the accuracy of spill modeling in the OCNMS waters. This could help WSMC ICs more effectively direct response resources to high priority areas at risk, particularly early on in the response.
- This is not a direct WSMC issue, more of a personal thought regarding deck wash, gray/black water discharges and other non-oil discharges. The EPA Vessel General Permit program currently being implemented should help to reduce and/or eliminate these discharges while vessel transit Sanctuary waters. However, this program is only in effect when vessels come within 3 miles of the coast.

Donna Spalding, NW Cruise Ship Association  
12Aug09

Selected comments relevant to meeting discussions:

**What is in place?** I support the idea of preparing a flow chart that would detail what resources exist – not only within the Sanctuary – but near by to respond to an accident.

This should include reference to Burrard Clean, WISPA, First Nations initiatives, etc. I understand that Burrard Clean is a BC/Canada entity, but in times of an emergency I don't believe anyone would decline to assist for an area as important as the Sanctuary.

It should also include reference to the precautions taken by vessels. Cruise ships for instance have oil spill containment equipment on board, personnel are trained and drills are held continuously. Do other maritime vessels have these same capabilities?

This would provide a clearer picture of the holes that need to be fixed.

**A Plan.** There is really no need to reinvent the wheel. There are plans in place in Alaska (we are an integral part), in BC (I can help with contacts). Get copies ask for assistance in tailoring them to fit the needs of the Sanctuary. There are records of exercises, how they were planned, conducted, the results.

Support the initiative of the Makah Tribe. Recognize their objective to be ready - with equipment and trained personnel. Support their initiative for Federal (or any other) funding. In Alaska we support training sessions in various small communities through the South East Alaska Petroleum Response Organization (SEAPRO).

**Neah Bay Tug** – I attended the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the group organized to work through the legislation and required funding mechanisms. The tug is going to be there, however I believe that it is envisioned as a prevention vessel – responding to distress calls and preventing accidents. There is only so much one tug can do (my observation). There will be another meeting of the group in late August; Frank Holmes should be able to provide the best reports in this regard.

Working Group		Roster	Participation	
Name		Affiliation	Full Time	Document Review
Scott	Bornemann	U.S. Coast Guard District	X	
Chad	Bowechop	Makah tribe	X	
Joe	Bowles	Marine Spill Response Corporation	X	
Diane	Butorac	Washington Department of Ecology		X
Tom	Callahan	Washington State Maritime Cooperative	X	
Norm	Davis	Washington Department of Ecology		X
Mike	Doherty	Clallam County	X	
Dan	Doty	Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	X	
Fred	Felleman	Public interest	X	
Doug	Fricke	Local fisher		X
Tiffany	Gallo	NRC Environmental Services	X	
Tom	Gibbons	Quinault Nation	X	
Paul	Gleeson	National Park Service	X	
Jennifer	Hagen	Quileute tribe	X	
George	Hart	U.S. Navy	X	
Doug	Helton	NOAA Office of Response and Restoration	X	
Frank	Holmes	Western States Petroleum Association	X	
Leslie	Hughes	North Pacific Fishing Vessel Owners Association		X
Jerry	Joyce	Public interest	X	
Joel	Kawahara	Local fisher		X
Scott	Knutson	U.S. Coast Guard District	X	
Mike	Moore	Pacific Merchant Shipping Association		X
Meredith	Parker	Neah Bay Chamber of Commerce		X
Rebecca	Post	Washington Department of Ecology	X	
Bruce	Reed	Foss Maritime - tugs and barge/tugs	X	
Kevin	Ryan	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	X	
Warren	Scarlett	Hoh Tribe	X	
Theresa	Scott	Washington Dept.of Fish and Wildlife		X
Colin	Smith	National Park Service	X	
Donna	Spalding	NW Cruise Ship Association	X	
Fan	Tsao	Conservation		X
John	Veentjer	Marine Exchange of Puget Sound	X	
Eric	Wilkins	Intergovernmental Policy Council	X	
Ruth	Yender	NOAA Office of Response and Restoration		X